1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA	
10	JAMES DALE MOSELEY,	
11	Plaintiff,	CASE NO. C16-5698 BHS-JRC
12	V.	ORDER
13	WASHINGTON DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS,	
14	Defendant.	
15	Defendant.	
16	Before the Court are two motions to compel filed by plaintiff. Dkts. 44, 47. The Court	
17	denies both motions because plaintiff did not include a certification that he conferred with	
18	counsel for defendants before he filed his motion.	
19	In his first motion, plaintiff asks the Court to compel defendants to produce medical	
20	documents pertaining to hospital trips. Dkt. 44. In his second motion, plaintiff moves for the	
21	Court to compel defendants to produce an IMS Committee meeting agenda from July 8, 2016.	
22	Dkt. 47. Neither of plaintiff's motions include a certificate that plaintiff has in good faith	
23	conferred or attempted to confer with counsel for defendants. See Dkts. 44, 47. In response to	
24		,

plaintiff's motion, counsel for defendants submits a declaration, stating that plaintiff has not made any efforts to contact defendants regarding his discovery requests and that the parties have not met and conferred. Dkts. 48, 49 at ¶ 7 (Declaration of Marko Pavela, Counsel for Defendants).

While a party may apply to the court for an order compelling discovery, Fed. R. Civ. P. 37 and LCR 37(a)(1) require the movant to first meet and confer with the party failing to make disclosure or discovery in an effort to resolve the dispute without court action. In addition, when filing a motion to compel, the movant must include a certification, in the motion or in a declaration or affidavit, that the movant has in good faith conferred or attempted to confer with party failing to make disclosure or discovery in an effort to resolve the dispute without court action. The certification must list the date, manner, and participants to the conference. If the movant fails to include such a certification, the Court may deny the motion without addressing the merits of the dispute. See LCR 37(a)(1).

Plaintiff has failed to meet his requirements under the local court rule by not conferring with defendants' counsel by telephone or providing a certification of compliance with this rule. Therefore, the Court denies plaintiff's motions to compel (Dkts. 44, 47).

Dated this 4th day of May, 2017.

J. Richard Creatura

United States Magistrate Judge